arXiv:1409.6538v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 27 Aug 2015

Random matrix ensembles with column/row constraints: part I

Pragya Shukla and Suchetana Sadhukhan

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India

(Dated: August 28, 2015)

Abstract

We analyze statistical properties of a complex system subjected to conditions which manifests through specific constraints on the column/row sum of the matrix elements of its Hermitian operators. The presence of additional constraints besides real-symmetric nature leads to new correlations among their eigenfunctions, hinders a complete delocalization of dynamics and affects the eigenvalues too. The statistical analysis of the latter indicates the presence of a new universality class analogous to that of a special type of Brownian ensemble appearing between Poisson and Gaussian orthogonal ensemble.

I. INTRODUCTION

Linear operators with fixed sum-rules on the columns/rows of their matrix elements appear in widely different areas e.g. disordered systems [1–20], complex networks [21], financial markets [22] etc. Missing information due to complexity leads to randomization of the operator and it can appropriately be represented by a random matrix which satisfies all system specific conditions. The statistical behavior of the operator can then be modeled by a multi-parametric random matrix ensemble, with each of its matrices subjected to a fixed column/row sum-rule. A sub-class of such matrices, known as stochastic matrices or Markov matrices have been studied in past; almost all these studies focused on the properties of individual eigenvalues and eigenfunctions [23]. In context of a complex system however such an information does not serve much purpose: eigenvalues, eigenfunctions as well as other physical properties fluctuate from sample to sample and even within one sample and a knowledge of their average behavior is not sufficient. This motivates us to pursue an statistical analysis of the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the random matrix ensembles with column/row sum rule.

The conditions influencing the nature of a matrix ensemble can broadly be divided into two types. The "global" or "matrix" constraints e.g., symmetry or conservation laws which affect the nature of each matrix i.e its transformation and structural properties and introduce collective relations among the elements. On the contrary, the "local" or more appropriately "ensemble" constraints manifest themselves through ensemble parameters i.e the distribution properties of the matrix elements. A "matrix" constraint e.g. column sum-rule can coexist with different combinations of the "ensemble" constraints; this gives rise to the possibility of different random matrix ensembles with same matrix constraint. It is therefore desirable to understand not only the influence of matrix constraints on the statistical fluctuations but also the role played by the ensemble constraints. The present study considers the effect of a combination of global constraints e.g. Hermiticity and time-reversal symmetry besides column/row sum rule, as well as the ensemble constraints (e.g. disorder), on the matrix ensembles. Systems with such constraints exist in diverse areas e.g bosonic Hamiltonians such as phonons, and spin-waves in Heisenberg and XY ferromagnets, antiferromagnets, and

spin-glasses, euclidean random matrices, random reactance networks, financial systems and Internet related Google matrix etc.

The paper is organized as follows. Before proceeding for the mathematical analysis of column constrained matrices, it is natural to query the origin of these constraints from a physicist's perspective. The section II briefly introduces a few examples from different areas so as to reveal wide-applicability of the ensembles with column/row constraints. The section also helps to reveal connections among seemingly different areas in which a same mathematical constraint originates from different physical conditions. The column/row constraints introduce new correlations among the matrix elements which influence their distribution and can lead to a wide range of random matrix ensembles; section III discusses how various possibilities may arise in context of the constrained matrices with real-symmetric elements. The eigenvalues/eigenfunction fluctuations being standard tools to analyze the ensemble statistics, it is natural to seek the imprints of constraints on them. The section IV analyzes the effect of these constraints on the joint eigenvalue-eigenfunction density. The latter turns out to be analogous to that of a well-known ensemble, known as Brownian ensemble, without column/row constraints and with many known, although approximate, results for its fluctuation measures; the analogy is used in section V to gain statistical information about the column constrained ensembles (CCE). The section VI concludes this study with a brief reviews of our main results and open questions.

.

II. EXAMPLES OF SYSTEMS WITH COLUMN/ ROW SUM RULES

The appearance of column/row constraints in the matrices representing a complex system is not directly obvious. To explain, we briefly discuss few examples from different areas.

Goldstone modes: Goldstone modes are low-energy excitations in a system (e.g. phonons, spin-waves) in which a continuous symmetry (also referred as Goldstone symmetry) of the Hamiltonian is broken by the ground state. The Goldstone symmetry represents the invariance of a linear operator, say Hamiltonian H, under a uniform shift in a local configuration

variable. This implies $[H, b] = 0$ where $b = \sum_{k=1}^{N} b_k$, with b_k as the creation operator for the shift at the basis-state $|k\rangle$ in a discrete N-dimensional basis ($k = 1, .., N$). The mode $\sum_{k=1}^{N} |u_k\rangle$, with $|u_k\rangle = b_k|0\rangle$ is then an eigenstate of H, with the same energy E_0 as the ground state $|0\rangle$ however it may differ in response to an external perturbation (thus indicating lack of symmetry).

The appearance of column/row constraints in systems with Goldstone modes can be explained as follows [1]. Using the $2nd$ quantization form $H = \sum_{m,n} V_{mn}\ b_m^T b_n$ and the relation $i\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial t} = [H, b_k]$, equation of motion for the state $|u_k(t)\rangle$ with $|u_k(t)\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t}|u_k\rangle$ becomes

$$\omega\ u_l = \sum_{k=1}^{N} V_{kl}\ u_k \tag{1}$$

with $\omega = E - E_0$ as the excitation energy and E_0 as the ground state energy. The uniform shift $u_1 = u_2 = .. = u_N$ in the ground state ($\omega = 0$) then gives the "column constraint" $\sum_{k=1}^{N}\ V_{kl} = 0$.

Eq.(1) is the eigenvalue equation for the matrix $H = V$ with eigenvalue ω and eigenfunction u with $u_k \equiv \langle k|u\rangle$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$ as its components. The excitation spectrum can then be obtained by an exact diagonalization of V subjected to zero column constraint. As bosonic excitations are characterized by $\omega > 0$, this subjects V to additional constraints (i) V must also be semi-positive definite, (ii) the eigenvector corresponding to lowest eigenvalue should be delocalized in the basis where the column/row constraint is satisfied. Eq.(1) can also be rewritten as the eigenvalue equation for another matrix $\mathcal{H}$, defined by $E\ u_l = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_{kl}\ u_k$, with $\mathcal{H}_{kl} = V_{kl} + E_0\ \delta_{kl}$. $\mathcal{H}$ is therefore subjected to non-zero column constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N}\ \mathcal{H}_{kl} = E_0$. Clearly the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{H}$ are same as those of V except for a constant shift E_0. The spectral statistics of the two matrices is therefore analogous. But the analogy does not extend to their eigenfunction statistics.

Random euclidean matrices: A $N \times N$ euclidean random matrix, say H, represents an operator associated with a random distribution of N points, with its entries given by a deterministic function of the distances between the points [5]. Consider N points, characterized

by position x_i in a d dimensional euclidean space, then

$$H_{ij} = f(x_i - x_j) - u\ \delta_{ij} \sum_k f(x_j - x_k) \tag{2}$$

with u as a real parameter. The case $u = 1$ satisfies the column/row constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{kl} = 0$; this case appears e.g in studies on vibrational properties of amorphous solids (glasses or supercooled liquids) [5, 6] or random master equation [19]. The case $u = 0$ corresponds to the cases with euclidean correlations among matrix elements which subjects matrix elements to additional constraints besides column/row constraints. (The stability requirement of matter imposes another constraint i.e spectrum to be positive definite). Such matrices exist in many areas e.g random lasing or nonlinear optical phenomena [7], collective spontaneous emission (super-radiance) [8], multiple scattering or waves in random medium and Anderson localization [9–11] and instability in nonlinear random medium [12–14].

Conductance in nano-wire junctions and random reactance networks Natural appearance of the multiple wire-junctions in any quantum circuit has motivated great deal of research interest and different frameworks have been introduced to probe their transport properties. In Tomonaga-Luttinger (TL) model of a quantum wire-junction, the scattering matrix S at the junction can be expressed in terms of a Hermitian matrix U which is subjected to column/ row constraints due to Kirchoff's laws along with other conservation laws [4, 20]. For example, for a junction of N wires, each point Q in the bulk can be parameterized by the pair (x, i) with E_i as the edge, $i = 1 \ldots N$, and x as the distance of point Q from the vertex along that edge. As discussed in [4], with a point like defect localized at the vertex of the junction, both S and U are $N \times N$ matrices:

$$S(k) = -\frac{\lambda(1-U) - k(1+U)}{\lambda(1-U) + k(1+U)} \tag{3}$$

with k as the conjugate variable to x and λ as a parameter which fixes the scale at which scattering matrix is given exactly by U: $S(k = \lambda) = U$ for $\lambda \neq 0$. As discussed in [4], both S and U are subjected to the constraint $\sum_{m=1}^{N} S_{ml} = \sum_{m=1}^{N} U_{ml} = 1$; here $m, l = 1 \ldots N$ label the edges of the junction. As The column/ row constrained matrices also appear in random RLC networks, made of random mixture of capacitance C, inductance L and resistance R [17, 18]; here again the constraint arises due to Kirchoff's laws.

Page Rank Algorithm and Google Matrix: The information retrieval from the enormous database of world Wide Web (WWW) is based on various algorithms to rank the web-page. One such algorithm, known as page rank algorithm (PRA) is the basis of Google search engine; it efficiently determines a vector, referred as page rank vector, ranking the nodes of a network by order of their importance. This vector is an eigenfunction of the Google matrix [21] which is related to the adjacency matrix A of the complex network connecting the nodes of world-wide-web.

Assuming N nodes, A can be written as a $N \times N$ matrix, with its elements characterizing the links between the nodes. Another matrix S, corresponding to the transitions in a Markov chain of the network, can now be constructed from A such that the sum of all elements in any column of S is equal to unity: $S_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij}}{\sum_k A_{kj}}$ if $\sum_k A_{kj} > 0$ and $S_{ij} = \frac{1}{N}$ if $A_{kj} = 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, ..N$. Such a construction replaces the columns, with zero matrix elements (referred as dangling nodes) by a constant value $1/N$; this adds a link from every dangling node to every other node and is suitable for PageRank algorithm. The Google matrix can now be written as

$$G = \gamma\, S + (1 - \gamma)E \tag{4}$$

where E is a uniform matrix: $E_{ij} = 1$ and γ is known as a damping factor (with $(1 - \gamma)$ corresponding to a surfer's probability to jump to any page). As clear from the definition, both S and G satisfy the column sum-rule $\sum_i S_{ij} = 1$ and $\sum_i G_{ij} = \gamma + (1 - \gamma)N$.

Financial markets and pattern games: Pattern games are well-studied realistic agent-based models of financial markets. The dynamic nature of interactions among economic agents (due to constant thinking and altering the decision) gives rise to fluctuations which are similar in nature as in a disordered system (although their origins are different). Several attempts have been made in past to describe pattern games as disordered spin systems [22]; the available information about the disordered-spin dynamics can further be used to probe the market-dynamics. Similar ideas can be extended to conceive a game of interacting agents with multiple strategies which can be mapped to a classical spin system with Goldstone modes; these ideas are yet to be explored.

III. EFFECT OF COLUMN/ROW SUM RULE ON MATRIX ELEMENTS DISTRIBUTION

Consider a complex system with its behavior described by a $N \times N$ real-symmetric random matrix H subjected to column/row constraints:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{kl} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{lk} = \alpha_l. \tag{5}$$

where α_l is a constant; the rows being same as columns in this case, eq.(5) will be referred hereafter as "column constraints" only and α_l as "column constant".

In absence of any other information available about the system, the probability density $\rho(H)$ of the matrix elements of H can be derived using information-theoretic concepts: among all possible distributions subjected to given constraints, $\rho(H)$ is given by the one which minimizes the amount of information or alternatively maximizes the information entropy (known as maximum entropy hypothesis). A standard measure of the amount of information carried by a distribution $\rho(H)$ is given by Shannon's entropy, defined as

$$I[\rho(H)] = -\int \rho(H) \ln \rho(H) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(H), \tag{6}$$

with $\mathrm{d}\mu(H)$ as the measure in H-space. Using $\delta I = 0$ along with the column constraints and any other known constraints, the mathematical form of $\rho(H)$ can be derived using Lagrange multipliers method (see page 61 of [24] for detailed discussion).

As an example, we consider the case (i) $\rho(H)$ is normalized; (ii) the mean $< H_{kl} > \equiv \int H_{kl} \, \rho(H) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(H)$ and correlations $< H_{ij} H_{kl} > \equiv \int H_{ij} H_{kl} \, \rho(H) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(H)$ of the off-diagonals are known, (iii) the column constraint is given by eq.(5). These conditions alongwith the condition $\delta I = 0$ then leads to Gaussian form of ρ ([24]):

$$\rho(H) = \rho_s(H) \prod_{l=1}^{N} \delta \left(\sum_k H_{kl} - \alpha_l \right). \tag{7}$$

where $\rho_s(H)$ describes the probability density of the off-diagonals

$$\rho_s(H) = \mathcal{N} \prod_{l=1}^{N} \exp \left[-(\mathcal{H}_l - \mathcal{M}_l)^T \, (C^{(l)})^{-1} \, (\mathcal{H}_l - \mathcal{M}_l) \right]. \tag{8}$$

with $\mathcal{N}$ as a normalization constant, $\mathcal{H}_l = [H_{kl}]$ and $\mathcal{M}_l = [\ \langle H_{kl} \rangle\ ]$ as the column vectors of size $N-1$, consisting only of the off-diagonals and their mean, respectively. Further $C^{(l)}$ is the $N \times N$ covariance matrix, with its elements $C^{(l)}_{kj} \equiv \langle H_{kl}\ H_{jl} \rangle - \langle H_{kl} \rangle \langle H_{jl} \rangle$ describing the correlations between the elements of vector H_l (note the variance $\sigma^2_{kl} = C^{(l)}_{kk}$). The ensemble density (7) with ρ_s given by eq.(8) is later referred as the column constrained Gaussian ensemble (CCGE).

A Gaussian form of ρ_s in eq.(8) results only from the known constraints on the $1^{\rm st}$ and 2^{nd} order moments of each off-diagonal. The column constraint is imposed in eq.(7); it determines the diagonal density from those of the off-diagonals:

$$\langle H_{ll} \rangle \ = \ \alpha_l - \sum_{k=1;k\neq l}^{N} \langle H_{kl} \rangle \tag{9}$$

$$\langle H^2_{ll} \rangle \ = \ \alpha^2_l + \sum_{k,j=1;\neq l}^{N} \langle H_{kl}\ H_{jl} \rangle - 2\alpha_l \sum_{k=1;k\neq l}^{N} \langle H_{kl} \rangle \tag{10}$$

with $\langle . \rangle$ implying ensemble averaging. Information about higher order, individual moments can in general result in a non-Gaussian ensemble density. For example, the maximum entropy distribution turns out to be bimodal if each off-diagonal is independent and can take two possible values e.g. $H_{kl} = \pm a$, with a as a constant:

$$\rho_s(H) = \prod_{k,l;k<l}^{N} \left[\delta(H_{kl} - a) + \delta(H_{kl} + a) \right]. \tag{11}$$

Eq.(7) with ρ_s given by eq.(11) is later referred as the column constrained bimodal ensemble (CCBE). Note such distributions are often considered in spin-glass studies and random euclidean matrices; see for example [25].

Here we mention only the constraints leading to the Gaussian and bimodal densities, the two being often used distributions for the numerical as well as mathematical analysis. The system may also be subjected to constraints other than those on the matrix elements moments e.g eigenvalue density etc. The distributions for a few other cases are discussed in [24, 26].

IV. EFFECT OF COLUMN SUM-RULE ON EIGENVALUES/ EIGENFUNCTIONS

The sum rules on the entries of H in a column give rise to constraints on its eigenvalues and eigenfunctions which in turn influence their distributions. We first analyze the effect on a single matrix and subsequently on the ensemble. Here, for clear presentation of our ideas, we confine our study to the case with same column constant for all columns: $\alpha_l = \alpha$ for all $l = 1 \to N$.

A. Behavior for a single matrix

Consider a $N \times N$ real-symmetric, column-constrained matrix H with E and O as its eigenvalue and eigenfunction matrices, respectively; their elements can be given as $E_{mn} = e_n \delta_{mn}$ and O_{kn} where O_{kn} refers to the k^{th} component of the eigenfunction O_n corresponding to eigenvalue e_n (note O_{kn} is real in the basis $|k\rangle$ in which H is real-symmetric). As for a real-symmetric matrix without column constraints, the eigenfunctions in this case are mutually independent too, with their components distributed around a unit circle (i.e $\sum_k O_{kn} O_{km} = \delta_{mn}$ due to O being orthogonal).

The eigenvalues e_n are given by the roots of the characteristic polynomial Det$((H - E)$. Invoking the sum-rule $\sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{kl} = \alpha$ and noting that the addition of a scalar multiple of one row to another does not change the determinant, it is easy to show that one of the rows, say the first one, of the determinant Det $(H - \alpha I)$ is zero. As a consequence,

$$\text{Det } (H - \alpha I) = 0. \tag{12}$$

which in turn implies α as one of the eigenvalues of H.

The eigenvalue equation $HO = OE$ gives the relation $\sum_{k,l=1}^{N} H_{kl} O_{ln} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} e_n$. Using column sum rule, this can be rewritten as

$$(e_n - \alpha) \sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} = 0 \qquad n = 1, ..., N \tag{13}$$

which implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} = 0 \qquad\qquad e_n \neq \alpha \tag{14}$$

Squaring eq.(14), rearranging terms and using the normalization condition further gives

$$\sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} O_{kn}O_{ln} = -\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn}^2 = -1 \qquad \text{for} \quad e_n \neq \alpha. \tag{15}$$

The condition for the eigenvector components corresponding to eigenvalue α can be derived as follows. Using eq.(5), one can write Tr $H = N\alpha - \sum_{k,l;k\neq l} H_{kl}$. This alongwith the relation $H_{kl} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n O_{kn} O_{ln}$ and Tr $H = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n = \sum_{n,k=1}^{N} e_n\, O_{kn}^2$ gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n \sum_{k,l=1}^{N} O_{ln}\, O_{kn} = N\alpha \tag{16}$$

Substitution of eq.(13) in the above equation leaves, on its left side, only the term corresponding to non-random eigenvalue α, thus reducing it as

$$\left(\sum_{k}^{N} O_{kn}\right)^2 = N \qquad \text{if} \quad e_n = \alpha. \tag{17}$$

The above gives $\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} = \pm\sqrt{N}$ for $e_n = \alpha$ which alongwith normalization condition $\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn}^2 = 1$ implies $O_{kn} = 1/\sqrt{N}$ with $k = 1 \to N$ (or $O_{kn} = -1/\sqrt{N}$ for all k). The eigenvector corresponding to the non-random eigenvalue is therefore uniformly extended in the whole basis-space. (As all other eigenvectors must be orthogonal to the uniform eigenvector, this reconfirms the sum rule (14)).

As clear from eq.(14), an eigenvector corresponding to $e_n \neq \alpha$ can not be localized just to one basis-state i.e $O_{kn} \neq \delta_{kn}$; it must be spread over at least a pair of them (referred henceforth as the "pair-wise localization"). This indicates a new characteristic of a typical eigenvector (except the uniform eigenvector) of a column constrained matrix: the lack of single basis-state localization which is in constrast with an unconstrained real-symmetric matrix. As expected, this affects the maximum possible value of the inverse participation ratio (IPR), the standard tool to describe the localization behavior of an eigenvector and

defined as $I_2(O_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |O_{kn}|^4$. It is easy to see that $I_2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$ with $\kappa = 1$ or 2 for a typical eigenvector of a matrix with or without column constraints, respectively.

It is worth noting here that the column constant α determines the non-random eigenvalue but does not enter the eigenfunction constraints eq.(14) and eq.(17). As the non-random eigenvalue can be made zero by a shift of the origin of the spectrum, a real-symmetric matrix with column constant $\alpha \neq 0$ is equivalent to $\alpha = 0$. But the column constants are expected to play a more important role in the case in which they vary from one column to the other (eq.(5) with different α_l); this case is still under study.

B. Distribution of the eigenvalues-eigenfunctions

Our next step is to derive the joint densities of the eigenvalues and/or eigenfunctions from the ensemble density given by eq.(7). As the objective here is to understand the effect of column constraints on the statistics, H is assumed to have no symmetry constraints which could result in degenerate eigenvalues (except accidental degeneracy). H therefore has only one eigenvalue equal to α. (Note, for the degenerate case, the matrix can be written in a block form in the symmetry-preserving basis; the present analysis is then applicable to each block). As this can be any one of the N eigenvalues, hereafter we choose $e_N = \alpha$ (without loss of generality). For later reference, the eigenvector constrains can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} = \pm\sqrt{N}\, c_n, \qquad \sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} O_{ln}\, O_{kn} = (Nc_n - 1), \tag{18}$$

with $c_N = 1, c_n = 0$ for $n \neq N$, along with $O_{kN} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ for all $k = 1 \to N$.

Eq.(7) alongwith the relation $P(E;O) = \rho(H)J(E,O|H)$, with $J(E,O|H)$ as the Jacobian of transformation from the H-space to (E,O) space gives the joint density $P(E,O) \equiv P(e_1,\ldots,e_N;O_{11},O_{12},\ldots,O_{NN})$ of the N eigenvalues e_n and corresponding eigenfunction components O_{mn} with $m,n = 1,\ldots N$ (as defined above, E,O refer to the matrices of eigenvalues and eigenvectors). Note the matrix elements constraints now transform to those on the eigenvalues-eigenfunctions):

$$P(E;O) \;=\; \rho_s(E;O)\;\; J(E,O|H)\;\; \delta(e_N - \alpha)\;\; \delta_o(O) \tag{19}$$

where $\rho_s(E;O)$ is obtained from $\rho_s(H)$ by substituting $H = O^\dagger EO$: $\rho_s(E;O) \equiv \rho_s(O^T EO)$. and the $\delta_o(O)$ represents the constraints on the eigenfunctions:

$$\delta_o(O) \equiv \prod_{n=1}^{N} \delta\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} - \sqrt{N}c_n\right) \delta(O^\dagger O - I) \tag{20}$$

To proceed further, a knowledge of $J(E, O|H)$ is necessary. The column constraints along with Hermitian condition gives the $J(E, O|H)$ as

$$J(E, O|H) = \Delta_N(E) \mid_{e_N=\alpha} = \prod_{k,l=1;k<l}^{N-1} \mid e_k - e_l \mid \prod_{n=1}^{N-1} \mid e_n - \alpha \mid \tag{21}$$

with $\Delta_N(E) \equiv \Delta_N(e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_N)$ as the Jacobian of a real-symmetric matrix without column constraint:

$$\Delta_N(E) \equiv \prod_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} \mid e_k - e_l \mid . \tag{22}$$

An integration of eq.(19) over O-space, with DO as the Haar-measure, gives the joint eigenvalue density $P_e(e_1, ...e_N)$:

$$P_e(e_1, e_2, .., e_N) = \delta(e_N - \alpha)\, \Delta_N(E) \int \rho_s(E;O)\, \delta_o(O)\, \mathrm{D}O \tag{23}$$

The integration in eq.(23) depends on the form of ρ_s and is in general technically complicated. As examples, here we consider some simple cases:

Case I: $N = 2$: The integration in eq.(19) is straightforward if H is a 2×2 real-symmetric matrix with column constant α. This can be shown as follows. The column constraint along with real-symmetric nature of H implies $H_{11} = H_{22} = \alpha - H_{12} = \alpha - H_{21}$. The density $\rho(H)$ can then be written as

$$\rho(H) = \rho_s(H_{11})\delta(H_{11} + H_{12} - \alpha)\delta(H_{22} + H_{12} - \alpha) \tag{24}$$

The eigenvalues of H are $e_1 = H_{11} + H_{22} - \alpha = 2H_{11} - \alpha$ and $e_2 = \alpha$ (thus only e_1 is random). This along with eq.(24) and $J = \mid e_1 - e_2 \mid$ gives

$$P_e(e_1, e_2) = C \mid e_1 - \alpha \mid \rho_s((e_1 + e_2)/2)\, \delta(e_2 - \alpha) \tag{25}$$

with C as a normalization constant. It is easy to derive the distribution $P(s)$ of the eigenvalue-spacing $s \equiv (e_1 - e_2)$, the only relevant spectral statistics in this case: $P(s) = |s|\ \rho_s(\alpha + s/2)$.

Case II: Independent, Gaussian distributed off-diagonals with zero mean and same variance

Next we consider the ensemble density given by eq.(7) with

$$\rho_s(H) \ = \ \mathcal{N} \exp\left[-\gamma \sum_{k,l;k\neq l} H_{kl}^2\right] \tag{26}$$

with γ arbitrary; this case is later referred as the infinite range CCGE case or $d = \infty$ CCGE case. A preliminary idea about the expected statistics can be developed by first looking at the relative moments of the matrix elements. As here $\langle H_{kl}\rangle = 0$, $\langle H_{kl}H_{jl}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\ \delta_{kj}$, eqs.(9, 10) give the first two moments of the diagonals as (with $\alpha_l = \alpha$ for all l) $\langle H_{ll}\rangle = \alpha, \quad \langle H_{ll}^2\rangle = \alpha^2 + \frac{N-1}{2\gamma}$. A typical diagonal is therefore very large as compared to a typical off-diagonal, the ratio of their variance given as

$$\frac{\langle H_{ll}^2\rangle - \langle H_{ll}\rangle^2}{\langle H_{kl}^2\rangle - \langle H_{kl}\rangle^2} = N - 1. \tag{27}$$

This indicates the tendency of a typical eigenfunction to localize in the basis-space. But the weaker strength of the off-diagonals is compensated by their large number ($= N(N-1)$) and the localization is expected to be weak.

The above idea is further strengthened by looking at the eigenvalue-eigenvector statistics. Using the relation $H = O^T E O$, one can show $\sum_{k,l;k\neq l} H_{kl}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n=1}^{N} |e_m - e_n|^2\ f_{mn}$ (see appendix A for the derivation). This on substitution in eq.(26) gives

$$\rho_s(H) = \mathcal{N} \exp\left[-\frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} |e_m - e_n|^2\ f_{mn}\right]. \tag{28}$$

Here $\mathcal{N}$ is the normalization constant: $\mathcal{N} = \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\pi}\right)^{N(N-1)/4}$ and f_{mn} is a measure of correlations between the eigenfunctions O_m and O_n:

$$f_{mn}(O) = f_{nm}(O) \ = \ \sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{km}^2 O_{kn}^2. \tag{29}$$

Thus $f_{mn} \approx 0$ if O_m, O_n are localized on different basis states, $f_{mn} \approx 1/N$ if both are extended almost in whole basis. Further $f_{mN} = f_{Nn} = 1/N$ (due to $O_{kN}^2 = 1/N$ for all k alongwith the normalization condition $\sum_{n=1}^{N} O_{kn}^2 = 1$). By separating the repulsion terms of type $|e_m - e_N|$ from those of type $|e_m - e_n|$, eq.(28) can be rewritten as

$$\rho_s(H) = \mathcal{N} \exp\left[-\gamma \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} (e_m - \alpha)^2 \, f_{mN} - \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N-1} |e_m - e_n|^2 \, f_{mn}\right]. \tag{30}$$

As clear from the above, the repulsion of all other eigenvalues from the fixed one acts like a confining potential. Substitution of eq.(30) in eq.(23) for $\rho_s(H) \equiv \rho_s(E; O)$ gives the joint eigenvalue density $P_e(e_1, e_2, .., e_N)$ for the ensemble (26). Using a transformation of variables $r_n = \sqrt{\gamma}\,(e_n - \alpha)$, $P(e_1, e_2, .., e_N)$ can also be expressed in α, γ-free form

$$P_r(r_1, r_2, .., r_N) \;=\; \int \; P_c(r; O) \; \delta_o(O) \; \mathrm{D}O \tag{31}$$

where

$$P_c(r; O) \;=\; \mathcal{N} \; \delta(r_N) \; \Delta_N(r) \exp\left[-\sum_{m=1}^{N-1} r_m^2 \, f_{mN} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N-1} |r_m - r_n|^2 \, f_{mn}\right]. \tag{32}$$

The above implies an independence of the statistics from the column constant α or the distribution parameter γ. Further as $f_{mN} = \frac{1}{N}$, this reduces eq.(32) to

$$P_c(r; O) \;=\; \mathcal{N} \; \delta(r_N) \; \Delta_N(r) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} r_m^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N-1} |r_m - r_n|^2 \, f_{mn}\right] \tag{33}$$

The joint eigenvalue-eigenvector density given by eq.(33) is derived from eq.(26) without any approximation. To proceed further, an integration of eq.(31) over O-space in needed but the basis-dependence of f_{mn} makes it technically difficult; (contrary to unitary space, the results for an integration over orthogonal space are still not known; see [27, 28]). Important insight can however be gained by following qualitative analysis (based on a similar idea used in [29]). As clear from eq.(33), the behavior of P_c depends on the competition between two sums in the exponent. The first term chiefly acts as a confining potential on the mutually repelling eigenvalues; it makes $P_c(r; O)$ very small for $|r_n| \gg \sqrt{N}$, implying the spectrum

support to be of the order $\sqrt{N}$. The second term dictates the degree of localization of the eigenfunction and level-repulsion of the eigenvalues; as clear, $P_c(r;O)$ is large for the cases when $N\ |r_m - r_n|^2\ f_{mn} \ll 1$. Thus the eigenfunctions O_m, O_n corresponding to large energy separations $|r_m - r_n|$ are more probable to have small overlap and tend to occupy different parts of basis-space ($f_{mn} \to 0$ for $|r_m - r_n| > N^{-1/2}$). But those at short energy-ranges may share the same space (for $|r_m - r_n| < N^{-1/2}$, the 2nd term in the exponent is negligible even if f_{mn} is maximum i.e $f_{mn} \approx \frac{1}{2}$). The combined effect of the two terms is therefore an increased level-density in the bulk (for $|e_n| \ll \sqrt{N}$) with eigenfunctions relatively more extended as compared to those in the edges. A typical O-matrix for the ensemble (26) then consists of localized, partially localized as well as extended eigenfunctions. Writing $O = S + A$ where S is diagonal and A antisymmetric, one gets, for $m \neq n$,

$$f_{mn} = (S_{nn}^2 + S_{mm}^2)\ A_{mn}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\ A_{km}^2\ A_{kn}^2 \tag{34}$$

For a pair O_m, O_n $(m, n \neq N)$ occupying different parts of the basis-space (if $A_{kn} \neq 0$ then $A_{km} \to 0$), the last term of eq.(34) is relatively small. This gives

$$f_{mn}\ \approx\ (S_{nn}^2 + S_{mm}^2)\ A_{mn}^2, \qquad \text{for}\ \ m, n \neq N \tag{35}$$

Note the above approximation is also applicable to those O_m, O_n pairs in which one of them is localized and other extended. The 2^{nd} sum in the exponent can then be separated in two parts, one corresponding to uncorrelated O_m, O_n pairs (those for which eq.(35) is applicable) and the other containing contributions from rest of the eigenfunctions; the two parts will be referred as $\sum_{uncor}$ and $\sum_{rest}$ respectively. Using now orthogonal space Haar measure $\mathrm{D}O = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \mathrm{d}S_{nn}\ \prod_{k<n} \mathrm{d}A_{kn}$, eq.(33) can be integrated over A_{mn} variables with subscripts m, n referring to uncorrelated eigenfunction-pairs. Being a Gaussian integral, this eliminates the repulsion terms $|r_m - r_n|$ corresponding to uncorrelated O_m, O_n pairs and gives

$$P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N) \approx \mathcal{N}\ \delta(r_N) \prod_{m<n;m,n\in rest} |r_m - r_n| \prod_{k=1}^{N-1}\ r_k \exp\left[-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{m=1}^{N-1} r_m^2\right]\ I(\{r\}) \tag{36}$$

where

$$I(\{r\}) = \int \left[\prod_{m,n\in uncor} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{S_{nn}^2 + S_{mm}^2}}\right]\ \exp\left[-\sum_{rest}\ |r_m - r_n|^2\ f_{mn}\right]\ \prod_{n=1}^{N} \mathrm{d}S_{nn} \prod_{k<n;k\neq m} \mathrm{d}A_{kn}$$

(37)

Further insight in eq.(36) can be gained by noting that a typical term in the $\sum_{rest}$ is $O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$ ($|r_m - r_n|$ now very small and $f_{mn} \sim \frac{1}{N}$ for rest of the eigenvector-pairs) and its contribution is insignificant as compared to other exponent in eq.(36). Approximating $\exp\left[-\sum_{rest} |r_m - r_n|^2 f_{mn}\right] \sim 1$, the contribution to P_r from the integral I can then be treated almost as a constant. The above analysis, although a crude approximation, at least provides one information: the degree of level-repulsion is reduced due to presence of the localized eigenfunctions but is not completely removed. The statistical behavior of the ensemble is therefore expected to lie between Poisson and GOE, with bulk behavior more close to GOE than that of the edge. This behavior is confirmed by our numerics discussed in [48].

For a rigorous analysis, it is necessary to seek alternative routes. Fortunately, for applications to real systems, one is interested in large N-limit of the column constrained matrices; the statistics in this limit can be obtained by another route, based on the mapping of eq.(32) to another well-known ensemble, namely, Brownian ensemble (BE). The mapping is based on the analogy of eq.(33) to the joint eigenvalue-eigenfunction density of a Brownian ensemble [24, 29], intermediate between Poisson and Gaussian orthogonal ensemble. As discussed in detail in section V, the analogy can then be applied to seek information about the CCGE spectral statistics in large N-limit.

Case III: Independent, nearest-neighbor Gaussian hopping in d-dimension

Consider the case where H represents the Hamiltonian for a d-dimensional lattice of linear size L with a random nearest-neighbor hopping (Gaussian) and subjected to conditions leading to column constraints (later referred as CCGE case for arbitrary d) . All sites are assumed to be connected by a non-random component too. Using N-dimensional site-basis ($N = L^d$), the ensemble density for the case can again be given by eq.(7) but now

$$\rho_s(H) \;=\; \mathcal{N} \exp\left[-\gamma \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{l;l\in z(k)} (H_{kl} - b_0)^2\right] \prod_{k,l\notin z(k)} \delta(H_{kl} - b_1) \tag{38}$$

with b_0, b_1 as constants and z as the number of nearest neighbors of a site. The symbol $\sum_{l\in z(k)}$ refers to a sum over all nearest-neighbors of a given site k (excluding $l = k$ site) and $\sum_{l\notin z(k)} \equiv \sum_{l;l\neq k} - \sum_{l\in z(k)}$. As in the case II, here again it is useful to analyze the relative variances of the matrix elements. Substituting in eqs.(9, 10), $\langle H_{kl}\rangle = b_0, \langle H_{kl}H_{jl}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\delta_{kj}$ for a nearest neighbor off-diagonal, and, $\langle H_{kl}\rangle = H_{kl} = b_1$, $\langle H_{kl}H_{jl}\rangle = 0$ for a non-nearest neighbor, the first two moments of the diagonals can be calculated (again with $\alpha_l = \alpha$ for all l). This further gives the ratio of the variance of a typical diagonal to a typical nearest neighbor off-diagonal as

$$\frac{\langle H_{ll}^2\rangle - \langle H_{ll}\rangle^2}{\langle H_{kl}^2\rangle - \langle H_{kl}\rangle^2} = \frac{z - 2\gamma(zb_0 + N_z b_1)^2}{1 - 2\gamma b_0^2}. \tag{39}$$

with $N_z = N - z - 1$. For the case $b_0 = b_1 = 0$ (considered in [48] for our numerical analysis), this gives a typical diagonal almost z times of a typical off-diagonal (therefore weaker than the case II, see eq.(27)). But as the number of non-zero off-diagonals here is zN, much less than the case II, a typical eigenfunction is expected to be more localized than the one in case II.

To develop further insight, it is instructive to rewrite δ-function in eq.(38) as a limiting Gaussian: $\delta(x-a) = \lim_{\eta\to\infty} \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\pi}}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\eta\,(x-a)^2}$. As the modelling of physical systems by random matrix ensembles is usually considered in limit $N \to \infty$, we take $\eta = N$. Eq.(38) can now be rewritten as

$$\rho_s(H) \;=\; C_2 \exp\left[-\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\gamma \sum_{l;l\in z(k)} (H_{kl} - b_0)^2 + N \sum_{l;l\notin z(k)} (H_{kl} - b_1)^2\right)\right] \tag{40}$$

with $C_2 = \mathcal{N}\ \left(\frac{2N}{\pi}\right)^{NN_z/2}$.

To derive the eigenvalue density in this case, we proceed as follows. Substitution of relation $\sum_{l\notin z(k)} H_{kl}^p = \sum_{l;l\neq k} H_{kl}^p - \sum_{l\in z(k)} H_{kl}^p$ in eq.(49) reduces it as

$$\rho_s(H) = C_3\ \rho_{s1}.\rho_{s2} \tag{41}$$

with

$$\rho_{s1} = \exp\left[-N \sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} \left(H_{kl}^2 - 2b_1 H_{kl}\right)\right] \tag{42}$$

and

$$\rho_{s2} = \exp\left[-\sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N}\left((\gamma-N)H_{kl}^2 - 2(b_0\gamma - b_1 N)\ H_{kl}\right)\right] \tag{43}$$

and $C_3 = C_2\ \mathrm{e}^{-N(\gamma b_0^2 z + N N_z b_1^2)}$. Writing $\sum_{k,l;k\neq l} H_{kl} = N\alpha - \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n$ and using eq.(A10), ρ_{s1} can be rewritten as

$$\rho_{s1} = \exp\left[-\frac{N}{2}\sum_{m,n}(e_n - e_m)^2 f_{mn} + 2b_1 N^2\alpha - 2b_1 N\sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n\right] \tag{44}$$

To express ρ_{s2} as the function of e_n, O_n, one can write $H_{kl} = \sum_{m=1}^{N} e_m O_{km} O_{lm}$ which gives

$$\sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)} H_{kl} \ = \ \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n v_n, \tag{45}$$

$$\sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N} H_{kl}^2 \ = \ \sum_{n,m=1}^{N} e_n e_m u_{mn} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n,m}(e_n - e_m)^2 u_{mn}, \tag{46}$$

where

$$v_n \ = \ \sum_{k,l\in z(k)}^{N} O_{kn} O_{ln}, \tag{47}$$

$$u_{mn} \ = \ \sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N} O_{kn} O_{km} O_{ln} O_{lm}. \tag{48}$$

Here the 2^{nd} equality in eq.(46) is due to $\sum_{m=1}^{N} u_{mn} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} u_{mn} = 0$; the later follows from the orthogonality condition $O^T O = I$ which also gives $\sum_{n=1}^{N} v_n = 0$. By substituting eqs.(46) in eq.(43), followed by a substitution of eqs.(43, 44) in eq.(41), one can rewrite $\rho_s(H)$ as

$$\rho_s(H) = C_4\ \exp\left[-2\sum_{n=1}^{N}\omega_n e_n - \frac{N}{2}\sum_{m,n=1}^{N}(e_m - e_n)^2\ (f_{mn} + (1-\gamma/N)u_{mn})\right] \tag{49}$$

with $\omega_n = (N b_1 - v_n(b_0\gamma - b_1 N))$ and $C_4 = C_3\ \mathrm{e}^{2N^2 b_1\alpha}$.

Except for the Gaussian approximation of a δ-function, eq.(49) is exact. To reduce it further, however, one needs approximations which can be done as follows. As $O_{kN} = \pm\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ (same sign for all k, see eq.(18)), it is easy to see from eqs.(47, 48) that $v_N = z$ and $u_{nN} = u_{Nn} = \frac{v_n}{N} = v_n f_{nN}$ as $f_{nN} = 1/N$. This in turn gives $\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} v_n = -z$ and therefore a typical $v_n \sim -z/(N-1)$. Further, for $n \neq N$, eq.(18) gives $O_{ln} = -O_{kn} - \sum_{j\neq l,k} O_{jn}$. This on substitution in eq.(48) reduces it as

$$u_{mn} \;=\; \sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N} O_{kn}^2 O_{km}^2 + \sum_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N} \sum_{i,j=1;\neq k,l}^{N} O_{kn} O_{km} O_{in} O_{jm}. \tag{50}$$

From eq.(29), the 1^{st} term in the above can be rewritten as $z f_{mn}$. The 2^{nd} term, a sum over 4^{th} order product of different components of two different eigenvectors, is expected to be very small (as the components can in general be positive as well negative, resulting in cancellation of terms in the sum). It can therefore be neglected if f_{mn} is large which is the case for O_m, O_n pairs at small energy separations $|e_m - e_n|$. Note, similar to discussion in case II given below eq.(33), the O_m, O_n pairs with large $|e_m - e_n|$ are more probable to correspond to smaller $f_{mn} \sim 1/N$. The 2^{nd} term for such cases can be of the same order as the first term and can not be neglected. The above suggests that $u_{mn} \sim f_{mn}$ for all m, n pairs. This encourages us to approximate

$$v_n \approx -\kappa, \qquad\qquad u_{mn} + f_{mn} \approx c\; f_{mn} \tag{51}$$

where $\kappa = z/N$ and c is the ensemble average: $c = \langle \frac{u_{mn}}{f_{mn}} \rangle$. (Note in general the ratio u_{mn}/f_{mn} fluctuates for different O_m, O_n pairs which makes eq.(51) at best a crude approximation. But the results, which it leads to, are supported by our numerical analysis discussed in [48]). Substitution of eq.(51) in eq.(49) reduces it as

$$\rho_s(H) \;\approx\; C_5 \exp\left[-a_0 \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (e_n - a_2/a_0)^2 - \frac{cN}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N-1} (e_m - e_n)^2 \; f_{mn} \right] \tag{52}$$

where $a_0 \;=\; 1 - \kappa(1-\gamma/N) \;\approx\; 1-\kappa$, $a_2 \;=\; \alpha a_0 - b_1 N - \kappa(b_0\gamma - b_1 N) \;\approx\; N(1-\kappa) b_1$ and $C_5 \;\approx\; C_2 \; \mathrm{e}^{-N^2 N_z b_1^2}$. The eigenvalue density $P_e(e_1, .., e_N)$ can now be obtained by a substitution of eq.(52) in eq.(23); the transformation $r_n = \; (e_n - a_2/a_0)$ further reduces it

to α-free form $P_r(r_1, r_2, .., r_N)$ given by eq.(31) but now

$$P_c(r; O) \approx C_5 \exp\left[-a_0 \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} r_n^2 - \frac{cN}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N-1} (r_m - r_n)^2 f_{mn}\right]. \tag{53}$$

Note, contrary to eq.(33), eq.(53) is approximate; its α-independence follows only in the limit $N \to \infty$ and its dependence on γ is not very clear. An exact formulation for $P_c(r; O)$ in this case could possibly be dependent on the ratio $\alpha/\gamma^{1/2}$.

As $c/a_0 > 1$, a finite basis-connectivity in CCGE seems to reduce the degree of repulsion among its eigenvalues (see discussion below eq.(33)). The latter being a signature of the eigenfunction-localization, this effect is similar to the unconstrained ensembles with finite basis-connectivity.

Case IV: Independent off-diagonals with bimodal distribution

Let us now consider the case with all off-diagonals bimodal distributed (later referred as CCBE case for $d = \infty$). The ensemble density can again be given by eq.(7) but now

$$\rho_s(H) = \left(\prod_{k,l;k<l}^{N} [\delta(H_{kl} - a) + \delta(H_{kl} + a)]\right). \tag{54}$$

Using the representation of a delta function as a limiting Gaussian in large size limit i.e $\delta(x-a) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sqrt{\frac{2N}{\pi}}\, \mathrm{e}^{-2N\,(x-a)^2}$, eq.(11) can be written as

$$\rho_s(H) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{2N}{\pi}\right)^{N(N-1)/2} \sum_p \exp\left[-N \sum_{k,l;k\neq l} (H_{kl} - b_{p;kl})^2\right] \tag{55}$$

where $\sum_p$ refers to sum over all possible combinations of $M = N(N-1)/2$ variables $b_{p;kl}$, with each taking one of the two possible values: $b_{p;kl} = \pm a$ for $k \neq l$. Note eq.(55) expresses the bimodal ensemble density as a sum over Gaussian ensemble densities which can be referred as its "Gaussian components". Using $H_{kl} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n O_{kn} O_{ln}$, one can write

$$\sum_{k,l;k\neq l} b_{p;kl} H_{kl} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n\, g_{pn} \tag{56}$$

where

$$g_{pn} = \sum_{k,l;k\neq l} b_{p;kl}\, O_{kn}\, O_{ln}. \tag{57}$$

The orthogonal nature of O gives $\sum_{n=1}^{N} g_{pn} = 0$. Using eq.(A10) and eq.(56) along with the relation $\sum_{k,l;k\neq l} b_{p;kl}^2 = N(N-1)a^2$, eq.(55) can be rewritten as

$$\rho_s(E;O) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{2N}{\pi}\right)^{N(N-1)/2} \exp\left[-\frac{N}{2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} |e_m - e_n|^2 f_{mn}\right] B(e;O) \tag{58}$$

with

$$B(e;O) = \sum_{p} \exp\left[-(N-1)N^2a^2 + 2N\sum_{n=1}^{N} g_{pn}\, e_n\right]. \tag{59}$$

The joint probability density $P_e(e_1,..e_N)$ for this case can now be given by eq.(23) with ρ_s as in eq.(58). As clear from a comparison of eqs.(28, 58), ρ_s for this case is same as that of case II except for the term $B(e;O)$ and $\gamma = N$. Using $r_n = \sqrt{N}(e_n - \alpha)$, and, following similar steps as used in the derivation of eq.(32) from eq.(28), the density $P_r(r_1,..r_N)$ for eq.(55) now becomes

$$P_r(r_1, r_2, .., r_N) = \int P_c(r;O)\, B(r;O)\, \delta_o(O)\, \mathrm{D}O \tag{60}$$

with $P_c(r;O)$ given by eq.(33) and

$$B(r;O) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{p} \exp\left[-(N-1)N^2a^2 + 2\sqrt{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} g_{pn}\, r_n\right] \tag{61}$$

Clearly only those terms of the $\sum_p$ contribute to $B(r;O)$ for which the exponent vanishes i.e $2\sum_{n=1}^{N} g_{pn}\, r_n = \sqrt{N}\, N(N-1)a^2$ or equivalently, from eq.(56),

$$2\sum_{k,l;k\neq l} b_{p;kl} H_{kl} = N(N-1)a^2. \tag{62}$$

As left side of the above condition contains $N(N-1)$ terms, with each H_{kl} Gaussian distributed with mean $b_{p;kl}$, it can be satisfied in many ways e.g. if $H_{kl} = b_{p;kl}/2 = \pm a/2$ for all k, l pairs or $H_{kl} = b_{p;kl}$ for $3N(N-1)/4$ pairs and $H_{kl} = -b_{p;kl}$ for rest $N(N-1)/4$ of them. Thus the eigenvalue probability density for bimodal case is dominated, in large N-limit, by those Gaussian components in which almost all H_{kl} are of the same order as their mean $b_{p;kl}$.

The above gives $B(r;O)$ as a constant (equal to number of terms in $\sum_p$ satisfying the condition (62)). This alongwith $P_c(r;O)$ given by eq.(33), P_r in the bimodal case reduces to

a same form as the Gaussian case II. This is also reconfirmed by the numerically observed analogy of the spectral fluctuations for both the cases (see [48]).

Case V: Independent, nearest-neighbor bimodal hopping in d-dimension

As in the case III, let us again consider the dynamics in a d-dimensional lattice of linear size L but random component of the nearest-neighbor hopping is now chosen to be bimodal type. All sites are assumed to be connected by a non-random component too. In the N-dimensional site-basis ($N = L^d$), the ensemble density for the case is given by eq.(7) ((later referred as CCBE case for arbitrary d) but now ρ_s is as follows:

$$\rho_s(H) = \mathcal{N} \left(\prod_{k,l;l\in z(k)}^{N} \left[\sum_{q=\pm 1} \delta(H_{kl} - qa) \right] \right) \left(\prod_{k,l;l\notin z(k)}^{N} \delta\left(H_{kl} - b_1\right) \right). \tag{63}$$

Proceeding exactly as in the case IV above, the eigenvalue density $P_r(r_1, ..r_N)$ in this case can be shown to be analogous to that of the nearest neighbor Gaussian hopping case III i.e eq.(53).

V. SPECTRAL FLUCTUATIONS OF COLUMN CONSTRAINED ENSEMBLES

In past, there have been several attempts to study the spectral statistics of column/row constrained matrices (see for example ([5, 16, 17, 19] and references there in); the presence of correlations among their columns/rows makes the determination a technically non-trivial task. Previous studies [5, 16–19], often using field theoretic approach, have analyzed the $1-$ and 2-point correlations of the level-density (in the spectral-bulk) for infinite range CCEs. Here we consider a different approach, based on a mapping of the joint probability density of the eigenvalues of a CCE to that of a Brownian ensemble (BE) (of real-symmetric matrices, without column constraint). The BEs have been extensively studied during previous decade and a great deal of analytical/numerical information about their statistical fluctuations is available [24, 29–43]. The mapping facilitates the available information directly to be applied to an infinite range CCE which in turn helps in improvement of the previous results for 2^{nd} order correlations as well as determination of the higher orders. The approach also helps us

to analyze the CCEs representing more generalized system conditions, e.g CCE with nearest neighbor hopping etc with both Gaussian and bimodal disorder. The mapping is relevant for another reason too. As discussed in [44, 45], the spectral fluctuations of the generalized random matrix ensembles without column constraints can be expressed in terms of the BEs. The present study therefore connects an ensemble with column constraints to many other ensembles without them.

Before discussing the details of the mapping, we briefly review the Brownian ensemble first:

A. Brownian ensembles (BE): relation with column constrained ensembles

A Brownian ensemble of Hermitian matrices H can in general be described as a non-stationary state of the matrix elements undergoing a cross-over due to a random perturbation of a stationary ensemble, say H_0, by another one, say V: $H = \sqrt{f}(H_0 + \lambda V)$ with $f = (1+\lambda^2)^{-1}$ ([24, 31]). The type of a BE, appearing during the cross-over, depends on the nature of stationary ensembles H_0, V and their different pairs may give rise to different BEs [31, 46]. The present knowledge of ten types of stationary ensembles [47] leads to possibility of many such cross-overs and, consequently, many types of BEs.

In context of the column constrained ensembles of real-symmetric matrices, the relevant BE is the one appearing during a transition from Poisson $\rightarrow$ Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) [44]. With H_0, V as $N \times N$ matrices taken from Poisson and GOE respectively, the BE in this case is an ensemble of real-symmetric matrices H, free from any column constraint and described by the probability density

$$\rho(H) \propto \exp\left[-\frac{\eta}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} H_{ii}^2 - \frac{\eta}{2}(1+\mu)\sum_{i,j=1;i\neq j}^{N} H_{ij}^2\right] \tag{64}$$

with η as an arbitrary parameter and $(1+\mu) = (\lambda^2 f)^{-1}$; here $H = H_0$ for $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ or $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ and $H \rightarrow V$ for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. An ensemble of H matrices given by the above measure, is also known as Rosenzweig-Porter (RP) ensemble [34]. As H is a real-symmetric matrix, the jacobian of transformation from H-space to eigenvalue-eigenfunction-space is $J(r, O|H) \propto \Delta_N(r)$ (eq.(22)), with r_n as the eigenvalue and O_n corresponding eigenfunction (subjected

only to orthonormality constraint) for $n = 1, 2, \ldots N$ [24]. The joint eigenvalue-eigenfunction density $P_b(r, O)$ can again be obtained from the relation $P_b(r, O)\ \mathrm{D}r\ \mathrm{D}O = \rho(H)\ \mathrm{D}H$, with $\mathrm{D}H = J(r, O|H)\ \mathrm{D}r\ \mathrm{D}O$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} P_b(r; O) &= \Delta_N(r)\ \rho\left(O^\dagger\ r\ O\right) \\ &= \mathcal{N}\ \Delta_N(r) \exp\left[-\frac{\eta}{2}\ \sum_{m=1}^{N} r_m^2 - \frac{\eta\ \mu}{4}\ \sum_{m,n=1;m\neq n}^{N} |r_m - r_n|^2\ f_{mn}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the normalization constant and f_{mn} is same as in eq.(29). An integration of eq.(65) over O-space (subjected only to orthogonality constraint) gives the joint eigenvalue density P_r of BE: $P_{rb}(r_1, r_2, .., r_N) = \int\ P_b(r; O)\ \delta(O^\dagger O - I)\ \mathrm{D}O$ which can further be used to calculate the n^{th} order spectral correlation $R_n(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, the probability density of finding n eigenvalues at $r_1, r_2, .., r_n$, defined as

$$R_n(r_1, \ldots, r_n) = \langle \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1}^{N} \delta(r_1 - e_{i_1}) \ldots \delta(r_n - e_{i_n}) \rangle \tag{66}$$

$$= \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N) \prod_{k=n+1}^{N} \mathrm{d}r_k. \tag{67}$$

Using the above definitions, R_n for BE (later referred as R_{nb}) can be written in terms of $P_b(r; O)$: $R_{nb}(r_1, \ldots, r_n) = \frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\ \int\ P_b(r; O)\ \delta(O^\dagger O - I)\ \prod_{k=n+1}^{N} \mathrm{d}r_k\ \mathrm{D}O$.

All spectral fluctuation measures can in principle be obtained from R_n [24]. As eq.(65) indicates, the BE is a basis-dependent ensemble with statistics governed by a single parameter μ and thus appears, although deceptively, easier to analyze. In past few decades, there have been several attempts to derive an analytical formulation of their fluctuations but very few exact results are known. The reason lies in unavailability of the results for the integration over orthogonal matrix space (although some progress has been made during past decade, see for example [27, 28]). Note the unitary space integration, which allows the determination of BE statistics during Poisson to GUE transition [36, 39–41], has already been achieved [24].

In an attempt to circumvent the above difficulty, a new approach has been introduced during last decade [44–46]. Based on the single parametric formulation of the diffusion of their probability density, the approach connects the BEs to a wide range of multi-parametric

Gaussian ensembles of the same global constraint class. The mapping of a column constrained ensemble to the BE therefore connects the former to many other ensembles (e.g Anderson ensemble) which appear in different areas and have been studied by area-specific tools [44]. The information from these studies can then be applied to probe the column constrained ensembles.

Comparison of CCE cases II, IV with BE: For clarity, let us first compare the CCGE case (II) of section IV with BE. As clear from eq.(65), the probability $P_b(r;O)$ that one of the BE-eigenvalues, say $r_N = 0$, and corresponding eigenfunction O_N is extended i.e $O_{kN} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$, is of the same form as $P_c(r;O)$ given by eq.(33) with $\eta = \frac{2}{N}, \mu = N$:

$$P_c(r;O) \;=\; P_b(r;O)\;\delta(r_N)\;\delta\left(O_N - \Phi\right) \tag{68}$$

where Φ is a column vector: $\phi_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ for $k = 1, \ldots N$. (Note for $O_N = \Phi$, the orthogonality condition $\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn}O_{kN} = \delta_{nN}$ ensures that $\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} = 0$ for all other eigenfunctions with $n \neq N$). This permits us to express the spectral correlations of CCE in terms of those of the BE as follows. The definition (67) of R_n along with eq.(31) gives R_n for CCE, referred as R_{nc},

$$R_{nc}(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \;=\; \frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\int P_c(r;O)\;\delta_O(O)\prod_{k=n+1}^{N} \mathrm{d}r_k\;\mathrm{D}O \tag{69}$$

with $\delta_O(O)$ defined in eq.(20). But note the latter is just the orthogonality condition along with a non-random, uniform eigenfunction: $\delta_O(O) = \delta(O_N - \Phi)\delta(O^TO - I)$. Substitution of eq.(68) relates R_{nc} to BE statistics

$$R_{nc}(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \;=\; \frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\int P_{b;N-1}(r;O)\;\delta(O^TO - I)\prod_{k=n+1}^{N-1} \mathrm{d}r_k\;\mathrm{D}O \tag{70}$$

where $P_{b,N-1}(r;O) \;\equiv\; P_b(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-1}, 0; O_1, \ldots, O_{N-1}, \Phi)$ refers to the section of joint eigenvalue-eigenfunction density $P_b(r;O)$ for a $N \times N$ BE on the $r_N = 0, O_N = \Phi$ plane. This can equivalently be viewed as a sub-ensemble of the BE, consisting of the matrices each one of which has a zero eigenvalue and corresponding eigenvector as uniformly extended.

Using the definition of R_n (eq.(67)), the right side of eq.(70) can be written as the n^{th} order correlations $\tilde{R}_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n)$ of the BE sub-ensemble

$$R_{nc}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) = \tilde{R}_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) \tag{71}$$

where $\tilde{R}_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) = \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int P_{b;N-1}(r;O)\, \delta(O^\dagger O - I) \prod_{k=n+1}^{N-1} \mathrm{d}r_k\, \mathrm{D}O$.

Using eq.(66), it is easy to express the correlations in the sub-ensemble in terms of those of the BE (see Appendix C)

$$\tilde{R}_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) \approx R_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1+\delta(r_k)) \tag{72}$$

Applying eqs.(71, 72) for $n = 1$, the ensemble averaged level-density $R_1(r)$ of the CCE can be expressed in terms of that of the BE:

$$R_{1c}(r) = R_{1b}(r)\,(1+\delta(r))\,. \tag{73}$$

Thus the ensemble averaged level density of the CCE is expected to deviate from that of the BE near zero energy; (this is also confirmed by the numerics shown in figure 12(a) of [48]). Similarly, using eqs.(71, 72) for $n > 1$, one can write higher order spectral correlations of the CCE in terms of those of a BE: $R_{nc}(r_1,\ldots,r_n) = R_{nb}(r_1,\ldots,r_n)$ for $r_1,\ldots,r_n \neq 0$.

Alternatively, the CCGE case II can also be mapped to a $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ BE as follows: except for the constraint $\delta(r_N)$, eq.(33) is analogous to eq.(65) with $\eta = \frac{2}{N}, \mu = N$. Although the O-space integration in the CCGE case is subjected to constraints given by δ_O, the latter just reduces the size of the O-matrix space from N to $N-1$. The number of independent eigenfunction components in a $N\times N$ column constrained matrix is therefore same as that for a $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ real-symmetric Brownian matrix. An integration over eigenfunction-space of eq.(31) then renders an eigenvalue distribution for a CCGE analogous to that of a BE, except for a logarithmic potential term $\sum_k \log|r_k|$ in the exponent; the term originates from the level-repulsion of all other eigenvalues from the non-random one. As each term of type $\log|r_k|$ in the exponent of eq.(33) appears along with a quadratic term of type r_k^2, the former is negligible as compared to later for large $r_k \geq 1$. Furthermore as the level-repulsion between all non-zero eigenvalue pairs is same for both CCGE and BE, the

local correlations in the $(N-1)$ dimensional eigenvalue space (excluding zero eigenvalue) of a $N \times N$ CCGE are expected to be analogous to that of a $(N-1) \times (N-1)$ BE. The analogy is confirmed by the numerics given in [48].

Due to its eigenvalue-eigenfunction density being analogous to that of the CCGE case II, the above discussion is also applicable to CCBE case IV.

As already mentioned, there have been a number of attempts in past to obtain the spectral statistics of CCEs e.g the level density for random impedance networks in [18] and random master equations in [19], the level density and 2-point spectral (bulk) correlation $R_2(r)$ (with $r = |r_1 - r_2|$) of Euclidean matrices in [5] and [16] respectively (a field theoretic formulation), $R_2(r)$ for random reactance network (again for bimodal distribution, infinite range and only in spectral-bulk). Reducing $R_2(r)$ to an integral form similar to that of a GOE, the studies [16, 17] conclude that $R_2(r)$ in the spectral bulk of an infinite range CCE is analogous to that of a GOE; these studies are based on the field-theoretic approach using saddle point approximation. Our analysis however indicates that $R_2(r)$ of CCE is analogous to that of a BE (eq.(64) with $\mu = N$) which approaches a GOE near zero energy. But the BE-statistics deviates from that of a GOE, significantly at large spectral-ranges ([29], see also discussion below eq.(74)). Thus our $R_2(r)$-result for CCE does not essentially contradicts the result of [17] but provides an improved version applicable for ranges beyond the spectrum center.

Comparison of CCE cases III, V with BE: We now compare eq.(53) for the case III of section IV with eq.(65). As in the case II, the density $P_c(r; O)$ for this case can again be related to a BE given by eq.(68), with $P_b(r; O)$ given by eq.(64), but now $\mu = (c/a_0)N$ with $c/a_0 > 1$. Eq.(71) is therefore valid for this case too (with $\tilde{R}_{nb}$ now representing the n^{th} order correlation of the corresponding BE analog).

As suggested by the crude approximations, the parameter μ for the BE analog in this case seems to be larger than the $d = \infty$ CCGE case. An increased μ corresponds to an eigenvalue statistics shifted more towards Poisson distribution (see [29, 44]); this is indeed supported by our numerical analysis [48].

B. Fluctuations measures of CCE: exploiting BE connection

Eq.(65) indicates the non-stationary nature of the BE statistics: it varies significantly from middle of the band to the edge; (numerically confirmed in [48]). As shown by a previous analysis [29] of the BE with finite μ, the levels with sufficiently close energies i.e for energy intervals smaller than $E_\mu = 1/\sqrt{\mu}$ repel each other like a GOE. This can also be explained by an alternative formulation for the BE-statistics: the spectral fluctuations around $R_1(r)$ are governed by a parameter which is the typical off-diagonal square measured in units of the local mean-level spacing $\Delta_{local}(r)$ (referred as the spectral complexity parameter) [24, 44]):

$$\Lambda(r) = \frac{1}{(1+\mu)\Delta^2_{local}(r)} \tag{74}$$

Here $\Delta_{local}(r)$ is the local mean-level spacing: $\Delta_{local}(r) = (R_1(r))^{-1}$ for a BE. A variation of μ changes the level-density $R_1(r)$ of the BE from a Gaussian ($\mu \to \infty$) to a semi-circle ($\mu \to 0$) [35]. This changes $\Lambda(r)$ and therefore results in a cross-over of the BE statistics from Poisson ($\Lambda \to 0$) to GOE ($\Lambda \to \infty$) at a fixed r. As discussed in [35], for $\mu = \nu N$, $R_1(r) = N\ F(r)$ with $F(r) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\ \mathrm{e}^{-r^2}$ for $\nu \gg 1$. For $\nu \ll 1$, $F(r) \approx \frac{1}{\pi}\ \sqrt{2\nu - \nu^2 r^2}$ for $r^2 \ll 1/\nu$ but develops Gaussian tails for large $|r|$. Although the results for $\nu = 1$ are not known analytically, numerical studies indicates a semicircle behavior [35] in the bulk : $F(r) = \frac{1}{\pi N a}\sqrt{2aN - r^2}$ with a as a constant (see figure 12(a) in [48]). As the mean level density in the middle of the band is relatively higher than the edge, the BE-statistics for a fixed μ tends to GOE in the bulk but remains Poisson near the edge.

Eq.(74) indicates that, for the cases $\mu = \nu N$ with $\nu \sim 1$, $\Lambda(r)$ becomes size-independence in the bulk regime. As the level-statistics is governed by Λ only, it is size-invariant as well as intermediate between Poisson and GOE even in the limit $N \to \infty$ and is therefore termed as critical. These critical BEs form a one parameter family of non-equilibrium ensembles lying between Poisson and GOE equilibrium, and, with a size-independent level-statistics. Following analogy with BE, the level-statistics of the CCE is expected to approach an invariant form, intermediate between Poisson and GOE, in large N-limit; this is indeed confirmed by our numerical analysis [48].

Using the CCE-BE mapping, the BE results with $\mu = cN$ can directly be used for $N \times N$

column-constrained Gaussian and bimodal cases described by eqs.(26,38, 54, 63); some of these results are briefly reviewed in appendix B (for more details see [31]).

VI. CONCLUSION

In the end, we summarize with our main results and open questions.

Here we have analyzed the role of a specific global constraint for complex systems, appearing as column/row sum rules on their matrix representations and in combination with other local and global constraints. Our study, focussed here on column constrained real-symmetric matrices, reveals some of their important features e.g a non-random eigenvalue with corresponding eigenvector uniformly extended, the lack of single basis-state localization for a typical eigenvector which is in constrast with an unconstrained real-symmetric matrix. We also find that, in large size limit, the column constrained matrices are statistically analogous to a special type of critical BE, intermediate between Poisson and GOE. The BE analogs of these matrices are size-independent but depend on the type of their basis-connectivity; the one for finite connectivity depends on a single parameter but that for infinite connectivity is free of all parameters. The column constrained matrices therefore undergo a cross-over from Poisson to the parameter-free BE with basis-connectivity as the transition parameter. The exact value of the column constant has no non-trivial influence either on the matrix properties or the ensemble ones if it is same for all columns and the matrix is real-symmetric; this however may not be valid for more general cases e.g varying column constants, complex matrices etc.

As well-known, a real-symmetric ensemble without column-sum rule (a system with no other constraints except time-reversal symmetry) undergoes a Poisson to GOE transition but the column sum rule inhibits the cross-over from reaching to GOE. The inability of column-constrained ensemble to reach GOE at typical energy-scales (other than zero energy) can be explained as follows: the correlations arising from the column sum-rule make the diagonals effectively much larger than the off-diagonals (their ratio dependent on the number of non-zero elements in a column). This tends to localize the dynamics around the basis-states which however is opposed by the basis-connectivity (hopping etc). In absence of the column

sum-rule, the spectral statistics is governed by a competition between the diagonal disorder and hopping, resulting in a crossover from Poisson to GOE universality class but, in its presence, the disorder always dominates causing the equilibrium to occur midway between Poisson and GOE. The statistics in this equilibrium represents a new universality class, free of all parameters, and, obtained by imposing an additional symmetry (e.g. Goldstone symmetry) leading to column constraint along with time-reversal symmetry. Note this class is different from the ten well-known standard universality classes [47] which correspond to the infra-red renormalization group fixed points describing the ergodic limit). This is because, contrary to the previously known classes, the statistics in a column constrained ensemble approaches a fixed point lying in the non-ergodic regime [49]. (Note the universality of the spectral fluctuations of a column constrained ensemble follows from its mapping to a specific BE with an ensemble density dependent only on a single parameter namely matrix size N. As discussed in section V.B, the level-statistics of this BE is size-independent, free of any parameters and is universal in the sense that all systems modeled by this BE will have same statistics at a given energy. However the eigenfunctions of the BEs appearing between Poisson and GOE universality classes are known to be partially localized which manifest in non-ergodicity of the spectral fluctuations [29]. The CCE-BE mapping further implies a similar universality and non-ergodicity of the statistics for all systems modeled by CCEs, e.g. the systems discussed in section II. Appearance of nine more universality classes of CCEs is expected on similar grounds, arising in presence of the following combinations: Goldstone symmetry and no time-reversal (leading to complex-Hermitian ensembles with column constraints), Goldstone symmetry and half-integer angular momentum (leading to real-quaternion ensembles with column constraints), Goldstone symmetry along with one of three chiral symmetries (chiral ensembles with column constraints), Goldstone symmetry along with one of the four particle-hole symmetries (particle -hole ensembles with column constraints).

It is worth noting that a BE itself is a non-equilibrium state of a disorder-driven transition in space of ensembles subjected to a single global constraint i.e time-reversal symmetry. The appearance of an almost BE type ensemble as an equilibrium state of the transition in

column constrained matrices (two global constraints here, namely, time-reversal and column constraint) therefore suggests a hierarchy of equilibriums: the non-equilibrium states of the transition in the ensemble-space with lesser number of global constraints appear as the equilibrium states of the transition in the space with higher constraints.

As revealed by several studies in past, complexity gives birth to a great deal of hidden connections in seemingly very different scientific areas. Seeking the connections (i.e universality) is one of the most beautiful as well as useful aspects of scientific research. We emphasize that an important feature of our present analysis is revealing the connection between column constrained matrices and Brownian ensembles. Connection among ensembles within same global constraint class has been reported in past; for example, the statistics of the BEs and disorder Hamiltonians e.g. Anderson Hamiltonian, both with time-reversal symmetry, are analogous if their complexity parameters are same [44]. The present work further extends it by connecting the ensemble with different global constraint classes. As discussed in previous section, the CCE-BE connection also helps to improve the results obtained by previous studies [16, 17]. Another important connection not discussed here but worth exploring is between sparse or banded CCEs and the ensembles with enhanced diagonals (different from the BE or Rosenzweig-Porter ensemble); the latter appear in many interesting physical contexts e.g. two particle localization [50].

In recent years, there have been a lot of interest in statistical analysis of the bosonic excitations. The study presented here reveals the existence of a new universality class in the spectral statistics of Goldstone modes but it does not provide information about the eigenfunctions. The latter requires a study of the ensembles with both column constraints as well as an additional constraint (leading to an extended mode at the minimum eigenvalue). Similarly, for other applications, an investigation of CCE with different symmetry constraints and conservations laws is needed (e.g. the non-Hermitian ensembles with column constraints are applicable in Google matrix analysis).

Previous studies of the system-dependent random matrix ensembles with anti-unitary symmetries as the global constraints indicate a single parametric dependence of the fluctuation measures [44–46]. The search for a similar formulation for column-constrained ensembles

is desirable too; it will provide a common theoretical formulation for the cases with lower or higher basis-connectivity, anisotropic hopping, correlated off-diagonals etc. Our attempts so far in this direction are encouraging.

Acknowledgment

We thank Robin Stinchcombe for educating us about the column sum rule in systems with Goldstone modes and many helpful discussions at an initial stage of this project. We also gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with Michael Berry, Deepak Kumar and John Chalker.

---

[1] S. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. 45, 574, (1973).

[2] V. Gurarie and J.T. Chalker, Phys. Rev. B, 68, 134207, (2003).

[3] Y.M.Beltukov and D.A.Parashin, JETP Letters, 93, 598, (2011).

[4] B. Bellazzini, P. Calabrese and M. Mintchev, Phys. Rev. B, 79, 085122 (2009).

[5] M. Mezard, G. Parisi and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. B, 559, 689, (1999).

[6] T.S. Grigera , V. Martin-Mayor, G. Parisi and P. Verrocchio, Phys. rev. Lett. 87, 085502, (2001); J. Phys. Cond. Mat. 14, 2167 (2002); Nature 422, 289 (2003).

[7] F. A. Pinheiro and L. C. Sampaio, Phys. Rev. A 73, 013826, (2006).

[8] A. Svidzinsky, J-T Chang and M. O. Scully, Phys. Rev. A, 81, 053821, (2010).

[9] M. Rusek, J. Mostowski and A. Orlowski, Phys. Rev. A, 61, 022704 (2000)

[10] F. A. Pinheiro, M. Rusek, A. Orlowski, and B. A. van Tiggelen, Phys. Rev. E 69, 026605, (2004).

[11] M. Antezza, Y. Castin and D. A. W Hutchinson, Phys. Rev. A, 82, 043602, (2010).

[12] S. Skipetrov and R. Maynard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 736 (2000).

[13] B. Zyuzin and A. Spivak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1970 (2000).

[14] B. Gremaud and T. Wellens, Phys. Rev. Lett., 104, 133901 (2010).

[15] T.S. Grigera , V. Martin-Mayor, G. Parisi , P. Urbani and P. Verrocchio , J.Stat. Mech., 110202015, (2011) (arXiv :1011.2798)

[16] C. R. Offer and B. D. Simons, J. Phys. A, 33, 7567, (2000).

[17] Y. V. Fyodorov, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 32, 7429, (1999).

[18] J. Staring, B. Mehlig, Y.V.Fyodorov and J. M. Luck, Phys. Rev. E, 67, 047101, (2003).

[19] A. J. Bray and G. J. Rodgers, Phys. Rev. B, 38, 11461, (1988).

[20] A. Agarwal, S. das, S. rao and D. Sen, arXiv: 0810.3513v4.

[21] B. Georgeot, O. Giraud, D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. E 81, 056109, (2010).

[22] D. Challet and M. Marsilli, R. Zecchina, Phys. Rev. E, 84, 1824, (2000).

[23] S.R. Asmussen, "Markov Chains". Applied Probability and Queues. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability 51, (2003); G. Latouche and V. Ramaswami, *Introduction to Matrix Analytic Methods in Stochastic Modeling*, 1st ed. , ASA SIAM, 1999.

[24] M.L.Mehta,*Random Matrices*, Academic Press, (1991).

[25] R.B.Stinchcombe and I.R. Pimentel, Phys. Rev.B, 38, 4980, (1988).

[26] Y. Sung Park and A.K. Bera, "Maximum entropy autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity model", Journal of Econometrics (Elsevier), 219, (2009).

[27] A. Prats Ferrer, B. Eynard, P. Di. Francesco, J.-B. Zuber, J. Stat. Phys., 129, 885, (2007).

[28] T. Gorin, J. Math. Phys. 43, 3342, (2002).

[29] J-L. Pichard and B. Shapiro, J. Phys. I: France 4, 623, (1994).

[30] F.Dyson, J. Math. Phys. 3, 1191 (1962).

[31] A.Pandey, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, 5, (1995).

[32] J.B.French, V.K.B.Kota, A.Pandey and S.Tomsovic, Annals of Physics, 181, 198,(1988).

[33] T. Nagao and P. J. Forrester, Physics Letters A 247, 42 (1998).

[34] N. Rosenzweig and C.E.Porter, Phys. Rev. 120, 1698 (1960).

[35] M. Krenin and B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett., 74, 4122, (1995); B. Shapiro, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B, 10, 3539, (1996).

[36] A. Altland, M. Janssen and B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. E, 56, 1471, (1997).

[37] F. Leyvraz and T.H. Seligman, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 23, 1555, (1990).

[38] H.Kunz and B.Shapiro, Phys. Rev. E, 58, 400, (1998).

[39] K.M.Frahm, T.Guhr, A.Muller-Groeling, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 270, 292 (1998).

[40] T. Guhr and E. Papenbrock, Phys. Rev. E 59, 330, (1999).

[41] S. Hernandez-Quiroz and L. Benet, Phys. Rev. E 81, 036218, (2010).

[42] V.K.B.Kota and S.Sumedha, Phys. Rev. E, 60, 3405, (1999). G.Lenz and F.Haake, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 1, (1991); E.Caurier, B.Grammaticos and A. ramani, J.Phys. A, 23, 4903 (1990). F.Leyvraz and T.H.Seligman, J. Phys. A, 23, 1555, (1990). S.Tomsovic, Ph.D Thesis, University of Rochester (1986).

[43] A. Pandey and P. Shukla, J. Phys. A, 24, 3907, (1991).

[44] P.Shukla, Phys. Rev. E, 62, 2098, (2000); J.Phys.: Condens. Matter 17, 1653, (2005).

[45] P.Shukla, Phys. Rev. E, (71), 026226, (2005); Phys. Rev. E, 75, 051113, (2007); Phys. Rev. Lett., 87, 19, 194102, (2001).

[46] P. Shukla, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B (WSPC) 26, 12300008, (2012).

[47] A. Altland and M.R.Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev. B 55, 1142, (1997).

[48] S.Sadhukhan and P. Shukla, Random matrix ensembles with column/row constraints, part II.

[49] The universality and ergodicity are two separate concepts which may or may not exist simultaneously. The universality of energy level-fluctuations for a class of systems implies that the fluctuations over the ensemble, representing any of these systems, at a given energy do not depend on any ensemble parameters and therefore system-dependent information (except for the global constraints representing the class) although they may vary from one energy to another. The ergodicity of spectral fluctuatons in random matrix ensembles implies that the fluctuations over an ensemble are same as the fluctuations along the spectral axis for a single matrix. An important example of universality without ergodicity is the Anderson Hamiltonian: the energy level fluctuations in an ensemble of Anderson Hamiltonians at a critical disorder are energy-dependent and non-ergodic (which is related to multifractality of wavefunctions at the critical point) but the level-statistics near $e = 0$ is known to be universal. Another well-known example of universality without ergodicity is the level-statistics of integrable systems which is given by Poisson ensemble; a localization of wavefunctions makes these systems are

non-ergodic.

[50] D. L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 2607, (1994); Y.V. Fyodorov and A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B, 52, R11580, (1995).

Appendix A: Derivation of eq.(28)

Consider a real-symmetric $N \times N$ matrix H with an eigenvalue e_n and corresponding eigenfunction O_n, with its components referred as O_{kn} for $n = 1 \to N$. Using the relation $H_{kl} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n O_{kn} O_{ln}$, a sum S_1 over all upper (or lower) off-diagonal matrix element squares of H can be reduced in following form:

$$S_1 = \sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} H_{kl}^2 \tag{A1}$$

$$= \sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1} e_n e_m O_{kn} O_{ln} O_{km} O_{lm} \tag{A2}$$

$$= \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} e_n e_m \left[\sum_{k,l} \left(O_{km} O_{kn} \right) \left(O_{lm} O_{ln} \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn}^2 O_{km}^2 \right] \tag{A3}$$

The orthogonality relation of the eigenfunctions gives $\sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{kn} O_{km} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} O_{nk} O_{mk} = \delta_{nm}$; its substitution in eq.(A3) gives

$$S_1 = \sum_{m,n} e_n e_m \left[\delta_{nm} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \right] \tag{A4}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n^2 + \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} e_n e_m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \right) \tag{A5}$$

$$= \sum_{n,j=1}^{N} e_n^2 O_{jn}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} e_n e_m O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \tag{A6}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} \left(e_n^2 + e_m^2 - 2 e_n e_m \right) O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \tag{A7}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} \left(e_n - e_m \right)^2 O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \tag{A8}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1;m<n}^{N} (e_n - e_m)^2 O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \tag{A9}$$

The above implies

$$\sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N} H_{kl}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} (e_n - e_m)^2 O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m,n=1;m<n}^{N} (e_n - e_m)^2 O_{jn}^2 O_{jm}^2 \tag{A10}$$

Substitution of eq.(A10) in eq.(26) and subsequent use of eq.(23) gives eq.(28).

The above result can also be used to derive eq.(65) from eq.(64). By rearranging the terms and using the real-symmetric nature of H, eq.(64) can be rewritten as $\rho(H) \propto \exp[-S_2]$ where S_2 is given as

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} H_{ii}^2 + \eta(1+\mu) \sum_{k,l=1;k<l}^{N-1} H_{kl}^2 \\ &= \frac{\eta}{2} \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{N-1} H_{kl}^2 + \mu \sum_{k,l=1;k\neq l}^{N-1} H_{kl}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

As the first term of eq.(A11) on RHS is the trace of the square of a $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ matrix H, we have

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^{N-1} H_{kl}^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} e_n^2$$

. This along with relation (A10) (now applying it for a matrix H of size $N-1$) leads to eq.(65).

Appendix B: Some spectral fluctuation measures for Brownian ensemble with $\mu = cN$

Here we briefly review some of the spectral fluctuation measures of the BE which, using CCE-BE analogy, can directly be applied for a CCE:

2-point density correlation $R_2(e_1, e_2)$: Defined as $R_2(e_1, e_2) = \frac{N!}{(N-2)!} \int P_e(e) \prod_{k=3}^{N-1} \mathrm{d}e_k$, it gives the probability of finding the eigenvalues e_1, e_2 at a distance $r = |e_1 - e_2|$. In large N limit, the small-r behavior of R_2 can be described by a closed form equation

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial R_2}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial^2 R_2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{R_2}{r} \right) \tag{B1}$$

The large N, large-r limit behavior for R_2, can be given as (see eq.(23) of [31])

$$R_2(r,\Lambda) \approx R_2(r,\infty) + 2\Lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{R_2(r-s;\infty) - R_2(r-s;0)}{s^2 + 4\pi^2\Lambda^2}\, \mathrm{d}s \tag{B2}$$

where $R_2(r,\infty) = 1 - \left(\frac{\sin \pi r}{\pi r}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\ \frac{sin\pi r}{\pi r}\right)\ \int_r^{\infty} \mathrm{d}x\ \frac{\sin \pi x}{\pi x}$ (GOE limit).

Due to Poissonian nature of unperturbed levels, the multi level-interactions can be neglected within perturbation theory approach. Thus, for small Λ, R_2 can be derived from diagonalization of the corresponding 2×2 dimensional submatrix [32]

$$R_2(r,\Lambda) \approx \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\ \int_0^{r^2/4\lambda} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-y/2}\, \mathrm{d}y}{\sqrt{y\ (r^2 - 4\Lambda y)}} \tag{B3}$$

Nearest-neighbor spacing distribution $P(s)$: For a 2×2 BE between Poisson and GOE, the probability of its nearest-neighbor eigenvalues to occur at a distance s can be given as [42]:

$$P(s,\Lambda) = \frac{s}{4\Lambda} \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{8\Lambda}\right)\ \int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{d}x \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{8\Lambda} - x\right]\ I_0\left(\frac{xs}{4\Lambda}\right) \tag{B4}$$

with I_0 as the modified Bessel function. As $P(s)$ is dominated by the nearest neighbor pairs of eigenvalues, this result is expected to be a good approximation for $N \times N$ case too, especially in small-s and small-Λ-result. This is confirmed by the perturbation theory based calculations for a general $N \times N$ matrix [42].

Number variance $\Sigma_2(r)$ *and compressibility* χ: The variance $\Sigma_2(r)$ of the number of the eigenvalues in a range of r mean level spacings, is a measure of the long-range correlations in the spectrum. As discussed in [24], $\Sigma_2(r)$ can be written in terms of $R_2(r)$: $\Sigma_2(r) = r - 2\int_0^r (r-s)\ (1 - R_2(s))\ \mathrm{d}s$. The number variance for $r \gg \sqrt{\Lambda}$, within perturbation theory approach, can be given as [32]

$$\Sigma_2(r,\Lambda) = r - 2\Lambda\left(\ln\frac{r^2}{2\Lambda} + \gamma - 1 + \ln 4\right) \tag{B5}$$

with γ as Euler's constant.

For critical statistics analysis, it is more instructive to consider the level compressibility $\chi(r) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\Sigma_2(r)}{\mathrm{d}r} = 1 - 2\int_0^r (1 - R_2(r))\ \mathrm{d}r$, a measure of long-range rigidity of the spectrum . A fractional value of $\chi(r)$ in $\lim_{r\to\infty, N\to\infty}$ is believed to be an indicator of the critical spectral

statistics ($\chi \to 0$ for a GOE, $\chi = 1$ for Poisson). It is also related to the tail of $P(s)$: $\lim_{s\to\infty} P(s) \sim \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{s}{2\chi}}$. As discussed in [44], for BEs intermediate to Poisson to Wigner transition, $\chi \approx (\pi^2\Lambda)^{-1}$ for large Λ-cases.

Appendix C: Derivation of eq.(72)

Consider the JPDF of the eigenvalues $P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N)$ of a $N \times N$ ensemble with eigenvalues $r_1, \ldots, r_N$. The JPDF of the sub-ensemble consisting of matrices with one non-random eigenvalue can be written as

$$\tilde{P}_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N) = N\ P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N)\ \delta(r_N) \tag{C1}$$

The ensemble average of the level density $\rho(r) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta(r - r_n)$ for the sub-ensemble can now be written as (with $\mathrm{D}^N r \equiv \prod_{k=1}^{N} \mathrm{d}r_k$)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_1(r) \equiv \langle \rho(r) \rangle &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int \delta(r - r_n)\ \tilde{P}_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N)\ \mathrm{D}^N r \\ &= N \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int \delta(r - r_n)\ P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_N)\ \delta(r_N)\ \mathrm{D}^N r \end{aligned} \tag{C2}$$

Separating the N^{th} term from the rest, eq.(C2) can be reduced as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_1(r) &= N \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \int \delta(r - r_n)\ P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-1}, 0)\ \mathrm{D}^{N-1} r + N\ \delta(r) \int P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-1}, r)\ \mathrm{D}^{N-1} r \\ &= N(N-1) \int P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-2}, r, 0)\ \mathrm{D}^{N-2} r + N\ \delta(r) \int P_r(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-1}, r)\ \mathrm{D}^{N-1} r \end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

Now using eq.(67) for $n = 1, 2$ in the above equation, one has

$$\tilde{R}_1(r) = R_2(r, 0) + \delta(r)\ R_1(r)) \approx (1 + \delta(r))\ R_1(r) \tag{C4}$$

Note here $R_2(r, 0)$ and $R_1(r)$ correspond to the correlations of the full ensemble.

Next we derive eq.(72) for $n = 2$:

$$\tilde{R}_2(r,r') \equiv \langle \rho_N(r)\rho_N(r')\rangle \;=\; \sum_{n,m=1}^{N} \int \delta(r-r_n)\;\delta(r'-r_m)\;\tilde{P}_r(r_1,\ldots,r_N)\;\mathrm{D}^N r \quad \text{(C5)}$$

Again separating the N^{th} contribution in the sum from the other terms, and using eq.(C1), one can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{R}_2(r,r') \;=\;& N\sum_{n,m=1}^{N-1}\int \delta(r-r_n)\;\delta(r-r_n)\;P_r(r_1,\ldots,r_{N-1},0)\;\mathrm{D}^{N-1}r + \\
&+\; N\delta(r)\sum_{m=1}^{N-1}\int \delta(r'-r_m)\;P_r(r_1,\ldots,r_{N-1},r)\;\mathrm{D}^{N-1}r + \\
&+\; N\delta(r')\sum_{n=1}^{N-1}\int \delta(r-r_n)\;P_r(r_1,...,r_{N-1},r')\;\mathrm{D}^{N-1}r \\
&+\; N\delta(r)\;\delta(r')\int P_r(r_1,...,r_{N-1},r)\;\;\mathrm{D}^{N-1}r
\end{aligned} \quad \text{(C6)}$$

Again using eq.(67) for $n = 1, 2, 3$ in the above equation, we get

$$\tilde{R}_2(r,r') \;=\; R_3(r,r',0) + \delta(r)\;R_2(r,r') + \delta(r')\;R_2(r,r') + \delta(r)\;\delta(r')\;R_2(r,r') \quad \text{(C7)}$$

$$\approx\; (1 + \delta(r) + \delta(r') + \delta(r)\;\delta(r'))\;\;R_2(r,r') \quad \text{(C8)}$$

Following similar steps, eq.(73) can be derived for other n-values.